		Review and Action Plan	Follow-up
Dash Board Items:	Staff Retention and Recognition	(February 2010)	
	CPS Missed Priority Timeframe	(August 2009)	
	CPS Issues	April: Home based chart was reviewed. Committee would like to review domestic violence data nationwide	April: Tonya will get nationwide data for next meeting
		<b>May:</b> Domestic Violence Nationwide Data - The main referral sources are family, the police, and schools. See attached graphs	May: Tonya will check
		Could we find out if there are cases that go out on DV and find other abuse?	
		June: It was asked if additional allegations get added to original DV charges. Tonya told the committee it would be very hard to get the data if at all possible. The committee will not ask for the data.	June: N/A
	CPS Survey	<b>April:</b> Data subcommittee is working on survey questions with Navina	April: N/A
		May: The survey was reviewed by Navina's team; the need results will be able to be obtained. There may be competition from another survey being conducted at the same time. The survey return rate will be about 10% by mail; by phone inquiry it would be about 25%. The survey would be mailed out with the possibility of a random sampling of phone calls. Domestic Violence cases would not be used as part of the survey for safely reasons.	May: N/A
	Multiple unaccepted CPS referrals	April: There are concerns about cases when there are multiple referrals that have been unaccepted. Possible reasons are: cases may not have been merged with previous cases for multiple reasons and how cases are staffed. It	April: Diane will bring the sample tool information. Marilee will send guidelines to committee

	alley Quality Improvement Committee Min	
Multiple unaccepted CPS referrals (cont.)	was suggested that after five unaccepted referrals the case goes to a different group to review the case besides Intake. The Safety model brings out the question, "How do we achieve safety?" The Region is looking to contract with The Children's Research Center, a company from Wisconsin for an evidence based model assessment tool. Twenty-two states are now using this tool. It should be ready for Utah to use in January or February of 2011. Policies need to be reviewed as they are right now. An overview of sample tools will be reviewed next month.	
	May: There is not a standardized type of audit for Intake. At present the procedure is: A person calls in to make a report, if the worker does not feel it qualifies for a referral (based on DCFS guidelines) they staff it with another Social Service Worker (SSW); the SSW does not have to be a supervisor. The unaccepted referral is reviewed to the letter of DCFS guidelines, random cases are reviewed yearly by the Case Process Review (CPR).	May: Diane will find a person from Intake to sit on a committee to with Dr. Hansen, Marilyn Johnson, and Stephanie Steele to review the process and make recommendations
	Misspelling is a common error. It is the responsibility of the Intake worker, the assigned worker and their supervisor to review the database for possible duplicate cases. They are held accountable to link those duplicate cases together.	
	The decision making tool that was discussed last month is a tree type system with points assigned and a place that human can add their input too.	
	The committee believes quality assurance is needed for Intake. Multiple unsupported and unaccepted referrals or patterns of escalation as well as referral from a professional should have more weight in the decision process.	

	Multiple unaccepted CPS referrals (cont.)	June: Darren Burdette, Janet Smuin, and Wendy Cole will join the Intake review ad hoc committee.	June: Marilee will send e-mail to committee to schedule meeting.
	Centralizing CPS Intake	May: It has been confirmed, Intake will be centralized; possibly by the end of the year.	May: N/A
Public Relations:		(February 17, 2009)	
Studies:	Youth in Care Final Report	June: Court and DCFS had similar data; all data showed 13% was delinquent behavior.  Each Region handles cases differently. Note: Northern is lowest, and Eastern is highest. It was mentioned that Northern has very proactive probation officers.  When youth were identified by DCFS case workers as being placed in DCFS custody due to delinquency were matched with juvenile court records, 62 percent had a child welfare history with the court.  The older children have low amounts of parental rights termination because the parents are usually not in the jurisdiction of the court. Of the youth in DCFS custody with a primary reason for delinquency, 64 percent had no felony episodes. Forty-four percent of the DCFS delinquent youth without a child welfare history have one to five delinquency episodes.  Children may be monitored closer if the family is lower functioning; it looks like parents in higher functioning families may not assist children to follow through on court assignments.  It is interesting that the delinquency and child welfare are fairly close; there could be a lot of overlap between the court and DCFS.  Questions the committee has:	June: Diane will talk to Dawn Hollingsworth (ARD, Northern) as to how Northern has lower numbers and who to talk to in the court probation.  Diane to bring report about teen pregnancy. Misty will check to see who received this report, and if the report can be broken out socioeconomically A probation officer and intake probation officer will be invited to the September meeting  Patty VanWagoner will be invited to the August meeting to discuss TAL issues

Second Quarter 2010 Page 3 of 5

	Youth in Care Final Report (cont.)	Why does Salt Lake have a high rate of not having permanency? (42%) How is Northern getting lower numbers? Who has received this report? Could report be socioeconomically broken out? Does probation interview children separately without the parent to find out if there are other issues beside delinquency? What is the outcome of TAL kids after they are released from care?Data on how TAL kids cases closed early? How are these children getting permanency? Do they get the same services if they leave TAL? How much accountability belongs to the kids to complete and how much is DCFS' responsibility?  Committee would like to invite specialist to answers to their questions and understand the report better.	
QCR Participation:	CFSR stakeholder interviews	May: DCFS needs five members of the committee to participate in stakeholder interviews for the federal review in June.	May: Teresa, Stephanie, and Dr. Hansen (or Julie from Safe and Healthy Families) have volunteered. If needed, Arn might be available.
Fatality Review:		(September 16, 2008)	
Other Business:			
	Changes	June: Brent Platt has been selected as the new director of DCFS to replace Duane Betournay. Staci Ghneim has been chosen to be deputy director, so she will be moving to the state office. Lisa-Michelle Church resigned as director of Human Services. Palmer DePaulis was appointed as the director of Human Services.	June: N/A
	Drug Endangered Child Presentation	April: The Drug Endangered Child (DEC) group would rather present to the rural communities. They realized that Salt Lake County has plenty of resources and would be able to access the information.	April: N/A
	Exit from TAL	Arn presented an experience with a young man who was discharged from court jurisdiction and DCFS custody without money or resources. It was suggested to have Jody Littlepage (from the	May: Committee was requested to review handout for discussion next month

	TAL alumni association) to come speak to the committee.	
Fiscal	April: Committee discussed ways to spend budget; suggestions included a presenter for training, get books (Crucial Conversations), go to Boondocks, miniature golf, or a movie theater. Northern Region got the book Crucial Conversations for their employees. If committee is interested, Carol Baumann is a good contact for additional information. It was suggested to combine QI money and money in the training budget to get more for employees. If training, it was suggested to ask employees for their interests. Jeff Bormaster from the Child Welfare League of America does a training called Supervision for Success, it has a child welfare feeling; if that is wanted, would need to have a couple of half day trainings. A local presenter for a brown bag lunch was also suggested. The committee agreed that a presenter (local or national) or book would be the best decisions that would be approved by the State office.	April: Subcommittees will discuss further next month.
	May: The neighborhoods were asked for suggestions of how they would like to see the money spent. Their suggestions were: new toys for visiting rooms, trainings, grants for trainings, Spanish translations of materials. The committee discussed the purchase of a library of books for each neighborhood (Arbinger books were discussed).	May: Committee will e-mail Mike book suggestions. Diane will talk to Eric Beidler (Training Manager) for the best way to distribute books.
	June: The committee discussed how monies in the QIC fund would be spent. Sets of books and CDs will be purchased for teams or neighborhoods to check out from the Training Academy for training and staff retention.	June: Marilee will order books and CDs